DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 481 RC 009 433

AUTHOR Carpenter, Edwin H.
TITLE Residential Preferences and Population Dispersal in Light of Proximity, Economics and Migratory Potential.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (New York, New York, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Size; Distance; *Economic Factors; Futures (of Society); Heads of Households; Income; Migration Patterns; Policy Formation; *Population Distribution; Rural Urban Differences; *State Surveys; Urban Areas; *Urban to Rural Migration
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona; Proximity; *Residential Preferences

ABSTRACT

In an effort to provide conceptual meaning to the role of residential preferences and their influence upon migration behavior in the context of a changing society, data derived from a 1973 statewide survey of Arizona heads of households (a random sample of 1,416 people) were analyzed in terms of: (1) residential preference and spatial proximity to a large city; (2) potential loss of income and a move to a small place; (3) the number of potential migrants to rural areas; and (4) the prospects for population dispersal. Findings indicated: the majority of the respondents preferred places of less than 50,000 in population, but that when conditionals were introduced, preferences for smaller places diminished greatly; the vast majority were satisfied with their present communities and had little or no desire to migrate even though they preferred smaller places; 14% of the respondents were potential migrants; 7% of the respondents were potential migrants from areas larger than 50,000 to smaller areas; the number of people interested in smaller areas decreased as distance from urban area increased and decreased further when the economic conditional of a 10% loss of family income was added; when controlling for potential migrants and nonmigrants, the percentage was further reduced; population dispersal would not take place without the aid of a national policy equalizing social and economic amenities. (JC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED129481

RESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES AND POPULATION DISPERSAL IN LIGHT OF PROXIMITY, ECONOMICS AND MIGRATORY POTENTIAL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Edwin H. Carpenter
(Rural Sociologist)

Department of Agricultural Economics

University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz. 85721

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, New York, 1976.

RC009433

RESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES AND POPULATION DISPERSAL IN LIGHT OF PROXIMITY, ECONOMICS, AND MIGRATORY POTENTIAL[1]

Edwin H. Carpenter
Department of Agricultural Economics
University of Arizona, Tucson

ABSTRACT

This paper reports the continuing efforts to bring into perspective the preferences people hold for residing in towns of less than 50,000 population. Population dispersal policy, or the lack of it, and the changing structure of society provides a backdrop for the importance of accurately measuring where people prefer to reside. When interest in residing in a small town is conditioned by that town's location being removed spatially from a large city, a decline in family income, and whether or not the individual is likely to migrate, it is found that very few people are candidates for residing in such locations.

The importance of the findings are discussed in relation to (a) the Federal stance that a national plan for population dispersal is not warranted and (b) the argument by proponents of a national policy for population dispersal that people should be allowed to live (and find gainful employment) where they prefer.

---

1. Data analyzed in this paper were collected under the auspices of Western Region Project W-118, "The Economic and Social Significance of Human Migration in the Western Region". The author appreciates the comments of reviewers of an earlier version of this paper.

RESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES AND POPULATION DISPERSAL IN LIGHT OF PROXIMITY, ECONOMICS AND MIGRATORY POTENTIAL

How the population of the United States is distributed has, in recent times, come into focus as an issue for policy consideration (Morrison, 1972a and b; Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972; National Goals Research Staff, 1970; Sundquist, 1970 and 1975; Dillman, 1973; Fuguitt and Zuiches, 1975; Fuguitt, 1971; Carpenter, 1975; Dillman and Dobash, 1970; Ryan, et. al., 1974; Zuiches and Fuguitt, 1972; DeJong, 1975). Policy wise, however, a set back was experienced when Secretary of Commerce, Frederick B. Dent, and Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Roy L. Ash, issued a report to the Congress in 1974 stating--"The objective of encouraging a more even population distribution is not considered to be a valid objective for a Federal program at this time" (Sundquist, 1975:239). Perhaps, part of the impetus for such a recommendation stems from census estimates that between 1970 and 1974 more people moved from metropolitan areas than to these areas, resulting in a net loss of 1,844,000 persons (Bureau of the Census, 1974a:1). Perhaps, this decision was reached because it was decided that the population is dispersing "on its own", precluding the necessity of Federal intervention.

That the population is actually dispersing, that is people are moving away from metropolitan counties, not just to suburbs in an adjacent county, is attested to by Beale (1975:6). He shows that from 1970 to 1973, the total U.S. population increase was 3.2 percent, metro increase was 2.9 percent and nonmetro increase was 4.2 percent. After breaking down the nonmetro counties into those adjacent to metro and those not adjacent to metro, he found that nonmetro adjacent counties grew by 4.7 percent while nonadjacent nonmetro counties grew by 3.7 percent--suggesting that some dispersion is in fact occurring.

Irrespective of the rational for Federal inaction on a policy for population distribution, proponents of such a policy continue to present arguments that various goals could be achieved by any number of national plans for population redistribution.[2] Among the goals, is one that is labeled "freedom of individual choice". This goal presumably would be achieved if people in this country could live and find gainful employment in the place in which they preferred to live. According to national public opinion polls, there appears to be a gross disparity between where people say they prefer to live and where they reside. In polls conducted by Gallup in 1966, 1970, and 1972, 50, 51 and 56 percent, respectively, preferred places under 50,000 population. A poll run by the Natural Wildlife Federation in 1968 found 51 percent preferred such places. In 1948, a Roper Poll found 48 percent prefer places under 50,000. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, in 1968, found 59 percent preferred places under 50,000 and the Population Commission, 1971, found 65 percent prefer the same.[3]

Taking from the various public opinion polls, the findings that large numbers of Americans prefer small town living, proponents of disperal for achievement of the goal of freedom of choice have seized on the discrepancy between where people reside and where they prefer to reside as a rationale for a national population dispersal policy. In his recent book. Dispersing Population: What American Can Learn From Europe (1975), Sundquist enunciates much the same argument. He maintains that people do not have freedom of individual choice to live where they prefer, rather:

> ...Freedom of individual choice, except for retired persons and a few self-employed persons such as artists and novelists who can make a living in any location, is largely an illusion. In the aggregate, the nation's 90 million

> workers must distribute themselves according to where the jobs are. And workers do not decide where jobs are located; employers do (1975: 256). The maximum freedom of individual choice exists when the aggregate pattern of job distribution approaches as closely as possible the way in which people would distribute themselves if they were truly free.(1975:257).

To achieve a distribution pattern that would reflect popular preferences would be difficult--but according to Sundquist..."to move now in the general direction of public preference, based on existing survey data revealing individual preferences--and better data that could be gathered with no great difficulty--is not beyond the range of possibility" (1975:257).

There is little question that better data is mandated before action is taken to try and achieve a goal of freedom of choice of residence--action that would, due to the nature of the goal to be achieved, be dependent on data (research) that accurately reflects what people prefer. It is reasonable to be suspect of the data that gave rise to the call for "freedom of choice", since prior to 1970 people were saying they prefer small town living as they "flocked" to large cities. This divergence in stated preferences and migration behavior may reflect the well known disparity between attitudes (preferences) and behavior or it may well be that Sundquist is correct in arguing that people simply cannot live out their preference while remaining gainfully employed. Whatever the case, attention in this paper will focus on population dispersal as it relates to place preferred as a residence.

Scope and Objectives

The primary objective is to provide data on where people prefer to live,

data that go beyond just reporting the size of place preferred. Specific questions to be addressed include: what spatial proximity, to a large city do people prefer?; what happens to preferences in the face of a potential loss of income that might accompany a move to a small size place?; how many people are potential migrants to nonmetro places?; and after the above is taken into account, what are the prospects for population dispersal?

The scope of the paper includes providing conceptual meaning to the role of residential preferences as they influence migration behavior in a context of the changing structure of society. The scope is presented first.

The Role of Residential Preferences

Underlying the goal of freedom of choice of residence and any policy that might be implemented to achieve such a goal, is where do people prefer to reside. However, the question arises, do residential preferences really indicate where people prefer to live? After all, almost half of the people interviewed in the 1948 Roper poll indicated a preference for living in a place of less than 50,000 inhabitants while the migration flow was predominantly from such places to the large cities, at that time and the years that followed. In recent years, as noted earlier, the migration flow has reversed and now preferences are increasingly consistent with migration behavior.

The answer to the question is probably "yes", realistically conceived preferences do indicate where people prefer to live--they were accurate in 1948 and they are accurate today. The divergence in such preferences and migration behavior is on the decline, it is argued, due to the changing structure of society--changes that increase the opportunity for people to live where they prefer.

Table 1 presents selected data for the United States that reflect changes in society--changes that increasingly allow for residential preferences to be "lived out". The matter is one of society increasingly becoming structured in a fashion that is conducive to increasing numbers of people living where preferred and if necessary remaining gainfully employed.

For people requiring gainful employment, service performing occupations are increasingly available in diverse locations.[4] By the nature of the case, service performing jobs, in large measure, are not location specific or geographically restricted -- at least not as restricted as agriculture[5], mining, and manufacturing. In the earlier years of an industrial society, the bulk of the occupations were to be found in mining, manufacturing, and similar goods producing related industries. Their facilities (plants) were pretty much location specific in this country. The options for where one could reside and remain gainfully employed, in such times, was somewhat restricted. As society moves beyond an industrial era to post industrial and some would say into a service sector economy, the geographical restrictiveness for job location diminishes. For example, real estate agents conduct their business in numerous locations, doctors (general practitioners), educators (primary and secondary) likewise. The list could be extended--the point is that people in service performing occupations have considerably more options for where to reside and remain gainfully employed. The data of Table 1 (part A) show that the proportion of service performing jobs has almost doubled since 1900 such that now almost half of the employment opportunities are to be found in the service sector of the economy. The implication is clear. The opportunity now exists for increasing numbers of people to live (and work) in a location they prefer.

Another factor that enables migration is the increase in disposable personal income. Since 1930, per capita disposable personal income (adjusted to 1958 prices) has more than doubled (Table 1, part B). Compared to earlier years, people increasingly have more money available for purchasing moves, a place to reside, and related relocation items.

Yet another important structural change is the apparent geographical dispersion that has taken place in where employment is available. Table 1 (part C) shows the average annual rate of change (per 100 persons) for metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas. As can be seen, nonmetropolitan areas have experienced an annual average rate increase in total employment (2.5 percent) between 1970-73 compared to lower rate increase of the 1960-70 period (1.4 percent). Nonfarm goods producing rates are pretty much unchanged and service performing average annual rates have seen an increase (3.0 percent for 1960-70 and 3.6 percent for 1970-73).

This compares to metropolitan areas where the average annual increase shows a decline from 1960-70 to 1970-73 for the total and both goods producing and service performing.

Turning to retired persons, several factors are of importance as regards living out residential preferences. Probably one of the most important structural changes is the increase over time in the provision of retirement benefits to employees of private firms. In 1950, 20 percent of the private labor force was covered by retirement benefits; as of 1970, 47 percent were covered by retirement benefits (Table 1, part D). Another factor is that annual average benefits have increased (in real 1958 dollars) from $991 in 1950 to $1,205 in 1970 (Table 1, part E). Age at retirement has declined. In 1962-63, 12 percent of all covered workers were in plans

with a normal retirement age of less than 65. By 1969, the proportion had increased to 31 percent (Table 1, Part F). Another indicator of the increase in early retirement is the declining labor force participation rates for males by age cohort. The presumption is that private retirement plans, with their allowance for early retirement, contributes to the decline in labor force participation rates (Taggert 1973:75). Table 1 (part G) shows that the participation rate decline is most dramatic for males 65 and over (1955 to 1971), is somewhat dramatic for the cohort that is age 55-64, and noticeable for the cohort age 45-54.

In addition to private retirement plans, social insurance retirement benefits have increased, in real 1958 dollars, from $50 per month in 1940 to $116 per month in 1973 (Table 1, part H). Also, there has been a substantial increase in the percent of the population age 65 and over that are receiving benefits--37 percent in 1950 to 90 percent in 1970 (Table 1, part I).

The picture is clear, there is increasing opportunity or ability, for retired persons to live out their residential preference. At the same time, retired persons make up an increasingly larger portion of the population--first because they increasingly are retiring early and secondly because persons age 62 and over now represent a greater proportion of the population (12.2 percent in 1970 compared to 5.4 percent in 1900--Table 1, part J).

Other factors--structural changes--that impact on being able to live where preferred include the nearly completed interstate highway system which allows for rapid transport of people and goods; increasingly sophisticated communication networks and their widespread coverage; air travel and transport networks, all of which serve to reduce isolation of any given place from any other place in the country.

At the outset of the section, the question was raised about the congruence of preferences and behavior. From the data presented on the changes that have occurred, it seems apparent that society is becoming increasingly conducive to people living out residential preferences. Probably no single change is responsible, but rather it is a mix of changes that in collective fashion have produced the conduciveness. Perhaps there is a threshold, a point or points when the collective change is sufficient for living out preferences by differing groups in society. Perhaps the structure of society is becoming increasingly conducive but some other factor is responsible for prompting large number of individuals to live out their preference--such as an increasing belief that the "grass is greener", a belief fostered by a social movement or movements, or environmental factors such as congestion, air pollution, noise.

Whatever the case, the structure of society can be viewed as the intervening obstacle (situational constraint) that, in earlier years, precluded consistency between residential preferences (attitude) and migration behavior (overt action)--an obstacle that is now less formidable.

Preferences, therefore, should be looked to as increasingly accurate predictors of migration behavior and consequently as useful in formulating the goal of freedom of choice of residence. What the residential preferences are, is the subject of the remainder of this paper.

Sample

The data reported here are from a statewide survey, conducted in 1973, of heads of households in Arizona. Names and addresses of potential respondents were drawn from the annually compiled Arizona auto registration list which was edited so that any given household appeared only once. The list, which enumerates 68 percent of the households in Arizona, was broken into 298 segments on the basis of the number of postal zip code

regions in the state. Names were then randomly selected from each postal region in proportion to the number of its inhabitants. Seventy-one percent of those receiving the mail questionnaire responded--1416 cases.[6]

Residence, Preferences, and Proximity

The first part of this section deals with the respondents' preferred size of area of residence and the preferred proximity in that area to the central city as compared to reported size of area of current residence and reported proximity to the central city. The questions used to make this determination are:

> Here are some descriptions of different kinds of areas in which one might choose to live. Each choice contains a different size major city, different amounts of open country, and some include suburbs or smaller towns. Suppose you could live in some part of any of these areas. In which one would you most like to live?
>
> LARGE METROPOLITAN: CONTAINS CITY OF 500,000 OR MORE, MANY SUBURBS, VERY LITTLE OPEN COUNTRY.
>
> MEDIUM METROPOLITAN: CONTAINS CITY OF 150,000 TO 499,999, SEVERAL SUBURBS, SOME OPEN COUNTRY.
>
> SMALL METROPOLITAN: CONTAINS CITY OF 50,000 TO 149,999, FEW SUBURBS, CONSIDERABLE OPEN COUNTRY.
>
> SEMI-URBAN: CITY OF 10,000 to 49,999 FEW SMALLER TOWNS AND CONTAINS MUCH OPEN COUNTRY.
>
> SEMI-RURAL: CONTAINS CITY OF 2,500 to 9,999, ONE OR TWO SMALLER TOWNS, MOSTLY OPEN COUNTRY.
>
> RURAL: CONTAINS TOWN OF LESS THAN 2,500, SURROUNDED ENTIRELY BY OPEN COUNTRY.
>
> Considering the area in which you just said you would like most to live, where within that area would you most like

to have your home located?

- IN THE CENTRAL CITY (OR TOWN) OF THE SIZE SPECIFIED ABOVE.
- IN A SUBURB OR SMALLER TOWN OF THE AREA SPECIFIED ABOVE.
- IN THE OPEN COUNTRY, WITHIN A 15-MINUTE DRIVE OF CENTRAL CITY (OR TOWN) SPECIFIED ABOVE.
- IN THE OPEN COUNTRY, MORE THAN A 15-MINUTE DRIVE FROM THE CENTRAL CITY (OR TOWN) SPECIFIED ABOVE.

The same response sets were used to determine the kind of area thought by the respondent to best describe where "you now live" and where in the area "your residence is located".

Table 2 reports the comparison of preferred and reported current area of residence and proximity where population size of the area is trichotomized into 50,000 plus, 50,000-499,999, and less than 50,000.

Additionally, Table Two presents data showing the size of the area of actual residence, using two different measures--the size of area based on respondents' zip code and the size of the area based on the town name reported by the respondent in response to the following question:

> "What is the name of your community? By community we mean the town or city in or near which you reside and depend upon most for goods, services or other possible needs such as a school, church and recreational facilities."

Very little difference is noted in size of area based on reported town name and respondents' zip code. When the three size of area of residence designations (as in Table 2) are employed, (data not presented) there is a 91 percent congruence between size using Zip Code and size

using the reported town name. Some of the error is probably incurred by questionnaires that were forwarded to respondents that had changed places of residence (and Zip Code) since the mailing list was computed. Another possible source of error is that some respondents are likely to identify with a community other than the one they are placed in by their zip code. This would be especially true around the major city of Phoenix where there are numerous smaller cities, towns, and rural areas, and where a likely identification would be with Phoenix proper.

Of greater concern, however, is how well the reported size of current area of residence coincides with actual size of the area of residence. Again from data (not shown) using the three size of area of residence designations (as in Table 2), 80 percent of the respondents correctly report the size of their area of residence when compared to the size of their area based on Zip Codes. Eighty three percent correctly identify the size when compared to the size of the town reported as their community of residence.

From the data of table two, it is noted that the percentage of people who report residing in areas of less than 50,000 nearly equals the percentage of people who are placed by zip code or reported town name in that size class. The divergence occurs in the large city and medium city size classes, with the percentage reporting a size of 500,000 plus being 6 percent less than actual (by zip code or town name) and the percentage reporting medium city size being greater then the actual (by zip code or town name). One possible explanation again refers to the complex of cities and towns that surround Phoenix. From data not shown, it was found that 24 percent of the respondents that named Phoenix as their residence indicated they lived in an area in the medium city size class. Also, 10 per-

cent of the respondents that lived in cities surrounding Phoenix--cities that are in the medium city size class--indicated they lived in the large city size class.

Before returning to size of area and proximity preferred, it should be noted that there is a fairly close congruence between reported county of residence and the Bureau of the Census estimates for Arizona in 1973 (Bureau of the Census, 1974b). The percentage of respondents living in Maricopa County (Large Metro) is 59.2 percent, in Pima County (Medium Metro) 20.7 percent, and in nonmetro counties (12 other counties combined) 20.1 percent. This compares, respectively, to the census estimate of 54.4, 20.4 and 25.5 percent.

While the above comparison are instructive, it remains the case that the size of area and proximity to a central city that one perceives to be reality is in large measure the factor that is going to influence behavior. That is, where a person perceives that he/she lives is more important for the purposes of this paper then where the researcher determines that the respondent actually lives. Consequently, the size of area of residence and proximity to the central city, as reported (perceived) by the respondent, is taken as the focus--in relation to preferences.

(Table 2 about here)

Areas of less than 50,000 population are preferred by 52 percent of the respondents while3 per cent prefer areas of 500,000 plus, with the remaining 45 percent preferring intermediate size areas (50,000 to 499,999 population).

If these people, based on preference, were to move--the largest areas would suffer drastic population loss, the intermediate areas would see some increase and the smaller size areas would see considerable increase. Proximity locations would also shift. About half (49 percent)

of the respondents presently reside in the central portion of their communites, with 13 percent preferring such a locale. Suburban locations would remain unchanged in population with 31 percent preferring suburbs and 31 percent reporting residing in suburbs.

Proximities in open country but within 15 minutes drive of the central city would show large influxes of people--43 percent prefer this proximity, with 14 percent presently living in this proximity. The most distant proximity--in the open country more than a 15 minute drive from the central city--is preferred by 14 percent of the respondents, compared to 6 percent who report residing in such a proximity. The major shifts are away from central cities and into open country less than 15 minutes from the central city.

Considering both size and proximity (Table 3) 7 percent of all respondents prefer a proximity closer to the central city than their present proximity. Of these few people, 27 percent prefer an area smaller than their present area, 59 percent the same size area, and 14 percent prefer large size areas. One third of the respondents prefer that their proximity to the city remain unchanged. Of these people, 31 percent prefer that the size of area be smaller than their present area, 63 percent prefer the same size area, and 6 percent prefer larger areas. Sixty percent of the respondents prefer proximity locations more distant from the central city than their present location. For this aggregate, 47 percent prefer areas smaller than their present area, 47 percent prefer the same size area, and 6 percent prefer a larger area.

(Table 3 about here)

In terms of size preference (ignoring proximity for the moment) these data are comparable to data provided in other recent studies--studies that are both state and national in scope. In each of the other eight

studies (two were national), over 50 percent of the respondents were found to prefer to reside in areas, places, cities or towns that are smaller than 50,000 population.[7] In the study reported here, 52 percent of the respondents prefer areas of less than 50,000 population.

Concerning proximity, a considerable proportion of the people prefer residential locations removed from the central city with very few who prefer central city living. When both size and proximity are considered, it is noted that there is some relationship between change in proximity location and change in size of area of residences. As preferred proximity moves from closer to the central city to more distant, the proportion of people preferring a smaller area of residence increases. Also, there is a relationship between size of current residence and size of area preferred.

While these data do not specifically address the question of how proximity conditions preferences, such as reported by Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975:495) (only 19 percent of their national sample of respondents prefer places of less than 50,000 population, if the proximity of the place is more than 30 miles of a city of 50,000 or larger--compared to 75 percent who prefer places of less than 50,000 population when proximity is ignored), they do point to the relationship between proximity and size of area preferred.

More closely approximating the inquiry made by Fuguitt and Zuiches about proximity, two questions were employed to assess interest for living in a place that is 2,500 to 10,000 population that is (a) a 30-minute drive and (b) at least one hour's drive from a place of 50,000 or more inhabitants. The questions utilized are as follows:

Some policy-makers have particular concern about

whether people want to move to relatively small communities. Suppose you were given the opportunity to move to a community with a population of 2,500 to 10,000 people and which is a 30-minute drive from a city of 50,000 or more people. You would be dependent on this new community for most of the things you do and buy. Which of the following best describes how you would feel about this opportunity?

- NOT AT ALL INTERESTED.
- NOT VERY INTERESTED, BUT WOULD PROBABLY CONSIDER IT.
- INTERESTED: WOULD PROBABLY CONSIDER IT CAREFULLY.
- VERY INTERESTED: WOULD GIVE IT VERY SERIOUS CONSIDERATION.

Now, suppose the community 2,500 to 10,000 was located at least one hour's drive from a city of 50,000 or more people. Which of the following best describes how you would feel about this opportunity? (Circle number).

- NOT AT ALL INTERESTED.
- NOT VERY INTERESTED, BUT WOULD PROBABLY CONSIDER IT.
- INTERESTED: WOULD PROBABLY CONSIDER IT CAREFULLY.
- VERY INTERESTED: WOULD GIVE IT VERY SERIOUS CONSIDERATION.

The first of these two questions provides information that approximates the information collected by Fuguitt and Zuiches on size of place and proximity while the second question goes a step further by specifying

a proximity location of at least 1 hour away from a city of 50,000 or more population.[8] Table 4 presents the results. As in the table 2, size of present area of residence is trichotomized.

(Table 4 about here)

Forty-five percent of the respondents are interested or very interested in living in a place of 2,500-10,000 population if it is 30 minutes drive from a city of 50,000 population (see last row of table). This finding accords well with the Fuguitt/Zuiches finding that 55 percent of their respondents prefer a place of less than 50,000 within 30 miles of a city over 50,000 (1975:495). The 10 percent divergence in the two studies may result from the difference in the way the questions are asked, with the lower percentage for this study following from the restrictiveness of specifying a place of 2,500-10,000 and the 30 minute drive rather than all nonmetro places and <u>within</u> 30 miles.

When the proximity location increased to at least one hour away, the percent interested or very interested declines from 45 percent to 26 percent. Looking for a moment only at respondents who are very interested--17 percent are very interested when proximity is 30 minutes, while only 8 percent are interested when proximity is at least 60 minutes. A more distant proximity, as it turns out, is an important condition that further delineates the interest in residing in a small size area.

One other aspect of the data should be noted--there is very little systematic relationship between size of present place of residence and interest in living in a place of 2,500-10,000 that is either a 30 minute or a 60 minute drive from a city of 50,000 or more inhabitants. What relationship there is, is manifested in the people who reside in medium metro areas--they are somewhat less likely to be interested.

Economic Conditional

As a means of checking for the effect of an economic conditional, all of the people who responded other than "not at all interested" to the two questions on interest in living a 30 minute or at least one hour's drive from a city of 50,000 or larger (the questions discussed in the latter part of the previous section), were asked:

> Would you still be interested if it meant you would have 10% less family income there?
>
> Yes, No, Don't Know

Table 5 presents a cross-tabulation of interest in living in a place of 2,500-10,000 population that is (a) 30 minutes drive (b) at least one hour's drive from a city of 50,000 or more people, by interest in living in such a place even with a 10% loss of family income

(Table 5 about here)

Overall, it is clear that interest drops when the economic conditional is taken into account. Seventy percent of the respondents express at least minimal interest (sum of first 3 rows, percent of total column) in living in a small place that is a 30 minute drive, with the percent interested dropping to 24 percent (percent of total, left most column) when conditioned by a loss of income. In the case of at least a one hour's drive, 50 percent were at least minimally interested before the economic conditional, but only 16 percent were interested after consideration of the economic loss.

Taking a more specific look at the effect of the economic conditional, it is noted that even some of the people who are very interested in residing in a proximity of 30 minutes or at least one hour's drive, lose interest when a loss of income becomes a condition. For the 30 minute proximity, 62 percent retained interest with an income loss. Seventy six

percent of the people who were interested in the 1 hour or more proximity retained an interest. As a brief aside, it is possible that the increased percentage retention of interest in the instance of the 1 hour or more proximity, is a result of a greater committment to try and live spatially removed from a city of 50,000 or more population, even though income may be reduced. The idea being, the further removed a person is interested in being from the city, the more likely that person is willing to forego city amenities and the potential for higher income. This explanation receives support, in addition to findings reported by DeJong & Sell (1975) on what people forego to move out from urban areas, from the fact that in both proximity situations, the more interested a person is in living spatially removed, the more likely there will be continued interested even with an income loss.

From data not shown, it was found that there is a no effect of size of present area of residence on respondents' interest conditioned by an income loss. In each of the three size of reported current area of residence categories, 8 percent of the respondents said "yes" they were interested in living in a place 30 minutes' drive from a large city even with a 10 percent loss of family income. The same lack of effect was found for the proposition of a 1 hour or more drive from a large city, where the distribution of those retaining interest was 6 percent for respondents living in areas of 500,000 plus, 5 percent for those living in the medium size areas, and 5 percent for the people living in areas of less than 50,000 population.

While no other studies are known to have reported findings concerning the effect of an economic conditional and, consequently, no basis for comparison, it is clear that the inclusion of the economic conditional contributes further delineation of the data as regards interest in living removed from a city of 50,000 plus population.

Potential Migrants

One of the more obvious means of delineating the residential preferences complex as regards the potential for movement is to establish what portion of the population in fact actually includes likely migrants. To differentiate potential migrants from potential nonmigrants the following two questions were asked:

How well satisfied are you with living in this community?

- NOT AT ALL SATISFIED.
- NOT VERY MUCH SATISFIED.
- PRETTY MUCH SATISFIED.
- VERY MUCH SATISFIED.

Which one of the following statements best describes how you would feel about moving away from this community if presented with that opportunity.

- I WOULD NEVER CONSIDER LEAVING HERE.
- I WOULD MOVE TO ANOTHER COMMUNITY IF I HAD TO BUT WOULD BE RELUCTANT TO LEAVE HERE.
- IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE TO ME WHETHER I LIVE HERE OR IN ANOTHER COMMUNITY.
- I WOULD PROBABLY BE MORE SATISFIED LIVING IN ANOTHER COMMUNITY.
- I WOULD REALLY LIKE TO LEAVE THIS COMMUNITY IF I HAD THE OPPORTUNITY.

The first question measures the respondents' level of satisfaction with present area of residence, while the second measures the desire to migrate from present area of residence. Previous research on movement, not migration, (Sabagh, et al., 1969; Rossi, 1955.66-67) indicated that desire to move is predictive of whether or not a move occurs. Additionally, level of satisfaction with location of residence (in a labor mar-

ket area) is implicated as important in the decision to move or stay (Speare, 1974:174-177; Orbell and Uno: 1972).

While it is true that the research cited deals with movement, and not migration, it seems reasonable to expect much the same relationships for migration as found for movement--of course the time lapse between being dissatisfied with present community and desiring to migrate and the act of migrating may be greater for migration than for movement.

Using both measures rather than one lessens the chance of erroneously designating respondents as potential migrants. As can be seen in Table 6, where level of satisfaction and desire to move are cross-tabulated, there are fewer cases (N= 189) in the upper left portion of the table than in either the first two rows (N= 258) or the first two columns (N= 301). In other words, people who would really like to move while being satisfied with their present place of residence are <u>not</u> classified as potential migrants even though they would have been had only the desire to move measure been utilized to select potential migrants.

Fourteen percent of all respondents are designated as potential migrants, with the remaining 86 percent classified as potential nonmigrants. While this classification procedure may seem unduly restrictive in terms of minimizing the percent of potential migrants, a more relaxed criterion for inclusion (see within dotted lines of Table 6) would increase the percent of potential migrants to 21 percent. In either instance, the number of potential migrants is small.

(Table 6 about here)

Adding migration potential to the earlier conditionals is obviously going to reduce, in large measure, the likelihood for migration to areas of less than 50,000 population.

As a first step to show the effect of classifying respondents as po-

tential migrants or nonmigrants, Table 7 presents data for two three-way crosstabulations. The left half of the table is--potential for migration, by interest (with a ten percent loss of family income) in living in a place of 2,500-10,000 inhabitants that is a 30 minute drive from a city of 50,000 or more residents, by size of present area of residence. The right half of the table is the same, except proximity to the large city is a one hour's drive.

(Table 7 about here)

In the left half of the table where proximity is a 30 minute drive, 7 percent (percent of column totals) of all respondents are potential migrants that are interested in a 30 minute drive proximity even with the 10 percent loss of family income, as compared to 17 percent who are interested but potential nonmigrants. Seven percent of the people are potential migrants but not interested given an income loss, and 69 percent are potential nonmigrants who are not interested given an income loss. Much the same pattern holds for the one hour's drive proximity to a city of 50,000 or more inhabitants (see right half of Table 7, percent of total). In an earlier section (Table 5), 24 percent of the respondents were interested, even with the 10 percent income loss, in living 30 minutes away, with 17 percent interested for one hour or more drive away. Now, considering potential for migration, the percentages have dropped to 7 and 5 percent respectively.

Concerning size of present area of residence, for <u>both</u> proximity locations, the percentage distributions are similar--half of the potential migrants who are interested are presently residing in large metro areas, with about 15 percent (17 and 14 percent for 30 minutes and one hour respectively) residing in nonmetro places. For potential nonmigrants who

are interested, 26 percent (30 minute proximity) and 24 percent (one hour proximity) are residents of large metro areas, about 40 percent (both 30 minute and one hour proximity) are residents of nonmetro areas.

Note that for potential migrants who are interested (for both proximities) a little more than half reside in large metro areas, while about 40 percent of the potential nonmigrants who are interested (for both proximities) are residents of nonmetro areas--a finding that is reasonable, given that many interested potential nonmigrants may presently be living under conditions described by the questions, with the bulk of the interested potential migrants desiring such conditions while presently residing in areas that obviously do not approximate the conditions described by the questions.

Continuing with the data of Table 7, not interested respondents (both proximities) who are potential migrants and nonmigrants, the reversal of percentage by size of present area of residence is most pronounced between those presently living in large metro areas and those in medium metro areas.

Preferred Size of Area and Proximity for Potential Migrants and Nonmigrants

In an earlier section (Table 2), it was noted that there was a relationship between size of area preferred and reported size of present area of residence. Likewise, preferred proximity to the central city and reported proximity were related. The question arises, will these relationships be maintained after controlling for potential for migration. It seems reasonable that potential nonmigrants would prefer an area that is roughly the size of their reported area of residence. Potential migrants, on the other hand, if size of area is at all important, should show little relationship between size of area preferred and reported size of area of

residence.

Table 8 presents size of area preferred by reported size of present area for both potential migrants and nonmigrants. Referring to the left half of Table 8 it can be seen that for potential migrants little relation exists between size of preferred area and reported size of present area.

Indeed, 68 percent of the potential migrants prefer areas of less than 50,000 with 76 percent of them reporting that they reside in large or medium size city areas. This stands in contrast to the earlier finding, when all respondents were treated aggregately, of a relationship between spatial size of area of residence and size of preferred area of residence. The lack of relationship for potential migrants suggests that they will not be disproportionately "drawn" from any particular size area, but rather will depart in roughly equal proportions from both large and medium size cities. From data not shown, of the potential migrants now living in the smaller places and preferring the same, 24 percent prefer areas smaller than their present area, 52 percent the same size area, and 24 percent prefer larger areas.

(Table 8 about here)

In the right half of Table 8, three percent of all potential nonmigrants prefer a large city area (similar to potential migrants) while 25 percent reside in an area that size. Of all potential nonmigrants, 48 percent prefer the medium size city area with 49 percent preferring smaller areas. Proportionately, potential nonmigrants prefer larger areas than potential migrants. Within the right half of the table, the percentages reflect the relationship between the reported size of area of residence and size of area preferred, a relationship that is absent for the potential migrants but expected for potential nonmigrants.

Potential nonmigrants tend to prefer areas either the same size or one size larger or smaller. From the data on size of area, before being trichotomized, data not shown, 37 percent of the potential nonmigrants prefer an area the same size as their present area, 28 percent prefer an area one category smaller than present area, 16 percent prefer an area more than one category smaller, 11 percent prefer an area one size larger, and 8 percent prefer an area more than one category larger. In other words, 76 percent of the potential nonmigrants prefer areas either the same or one size different then their reported areas of residence.

Table 9 presents data on proximity to the central city of the area of residence (both reported and preferred) for potential migrants and nonmigrants. As was true in Table 8, there is a stronger relationship for potential nonmigrants between reported proximity and preferred proximity than is the case for potential migrants. The left half of Table 9 reports percentages for potential migrants. Fourteen percent of the potential migrants prefer the central city, while 50 percent live in the central city, 12 percent prefer the suburb while 36 percent live there presently, 56 percent prefer open country less than 15 minutes drive from the central city, while 11 percent reside in such a proximity, with 18 percent preferring open country more than 15 minutes drive from the central city, with 3 percent actually living in this proximity. Clearly, the near and far proximities are not preferred as often as the open country--less than 15 minutes drive proximity.

(Table 9 about here)

Potential nonmigrants (right half of Table 9) contrast with potential migrants in that 35 percent prefer suburbs (vs. 12 percent for migrants) with 40 percent preferring open country--less than 15 minutes drive (vs. 56 percent for migrants). The distributions for proximity of reported

present residence are similar for both potential migrants and nonmigrants (see Percent of Row Total column).

By introducing the distinctions, potential migrant and potential nonmigrant and then controlling on them, the data presented in earlier sections takes on new clarity. The distinction further delineates the data on preferences with the result being fewer potential migrants to areas of less than 50,000 population.

Additional clarity is provided by the distinction as regards the relationship between size of present area and preferred area. The relationship is practically nonexistent for potential migrants while quite strong for potential nonmigrants. Also, over two-thirds of the potential migrants prefer nonmetropolitan size places, while less than half of the potential nonmigrants prefer places of less than 50,000 population. Preferences for proximity locations also vary depending on potential migrant status.

In brief, the distinction, potential migrant vs. nonmigrant, warrants greater emphasis in residential preference work, with the likelihood that preferences will be better understood when such a distinction is made.

Discussion and Summary

The declaration, in 1974, that the objective of encouraging a more even population distribution is not considered a valid objective for a Federal program, may in fact be premature. If the basis for the stance for Federal inaction stems from--(a) the findings of research and public opinion polls which report that over half of the American people prefer living in places of less than 50,000 population and (b) the recently noted, 1970-1974, migration turnaround is the start of a massive exodus to the hinterland--then it is premature (on the basis of these indicators)

to assume that in lieu of a national population dispersal policy, the people are going to hastily and evenly redistribute themselves.

It was argued at the first of this paper that the structure of society is changing such that increasingly people are able to live out their preferences. That is well and good, and if it were the case that over half of the American people were indeed committed to living in smaller towns and places, the Federal inaction might be appppropriate. That the majority of people do indeed have such a committment is questioned by the findings of this research.

It was found that the majority of respondents prefer to reside in places of less than 50,000 population--just like the findings reported in other research and by public opinion pollsters. However, as conditionals were introduced and examined, preferences for and interest in living in the smaller places diminished greatly. The vast majority of people are satisfied with their present communities and have little or no desire to migrate from their present areas of residence (even though they might prefer living in smaller places).

It was found that 14 percent of the respondents are potential migrants, with 68 percent of these people preferring areas of less than 50,000 population. Of the 68 percent, 74 percent report that their present area of residence has 50,000 or more population. In other words, 7 percent of all respondents are potential migrants from areas larger than 50,000 population to smaller areas. This compares to 1 percent of all respondents who are potential migrants from areas smaller than 50,000 population to larger areas. The six percent net gain for the smaller areas is far less than would be anticipated had preferences been left unconditioned by potential for migration.

Turning, specifically to interest in living in a small town and invoking the additional conditionals of proximity and economics, it was

found that the number of people that are very interested in living in a place of 2,500 to 10,000 population declines as the distance to a place of 50,000 or more residents increases. Seventeen percent of the respondents are very interested in a proximity of a 30 minutes drive to the larger city. For at least a one hour's drive proximity, the percentage declines to 8 percent. Adding an economic conditional of 10 percent loss of family income further reduces interest, with 6 percent of the respondents remaining very interested in the at least one hour proximity, even with the loss of income. Then, by controlling for potential migrants and nonmigrants, the percentage is further reduced. Three percent of the respondents are potential migrants who are very interested in living one hour or more from a city of 50,000 plus people given a 10 percent loss of income. By way of interest, 82 percent of these people report that they are residents of places having over 50,000 population.

By involving stringent proximity conditions, an economic conditional and a distinction between potential migrants and nonmigrants, it is indeed the case that migration to smaller places that are removed from large cities is unlikely to occur in mass.

The people that do move in the direction of the large to small, however, will not be selected disproportionately from any particular size area of origin. Like Fuguitt and Zuiches (1975:502) report, size of present area of residence is found to influence size of area preferred, but, only so long as the potential migrants/nonmigrants distinction is not made. When the distinction is made, the relationship no longer holds for potential migrants, hence they will likely depart proportionately from all sizes of areas.

In conclusion, these findings further delineate the meaning of residential preferences as regards population dispersal. Proponents of population dispersal, who base their case on the divergence between where

people live and where they prefer to live, will not find these results supportive since the vast majority of people apparently do not feel much committment to living dispersed. On the other hand, as was discussed earlier, society is becoming increasingly conducive to people living where they prefer. As the structure of society continues to change, the inimical aspects of living removed from the large cities may be removed for more and more people.

As for Federal inaction as regards a national policy for population dispersal, it does not appear that the population is going to rapidly disperse under its own impetus. A policy that would continue (or speed up) the structural changes that provide the opportunities for people to live out their preferences seems warranted. There is no denying the fact that the majority of respondents prefer to live in areas of less than 50,000 population. That proximity to a large city conditioned interest in a small place may indicate that most of the people were not willing to forego the amenities of the larger city--amenities that may or may not be a direct function of population size. Interest was also diminished by the prospect of a loss of income. Such a loss need not accompany migration to a smaller place removed from a large city--a national policy could be implemented that would seek to reduce the differentials in disposable income.

Footnotes

2. For a concise summary and explanation of various goals and plans to achieve such goals see Hoover (1972).
3. For more detail on the wording of questions used in the various polls and how the responses were grouped to determine size preferred, see Dillman (1973: 27-32)
4. Service occupation, as used in this paper, include these jobs defined as service jobs by the Department of Labor as well as the jobs that are nonfarm non-goods producing. Consequently, service performing jobs include all jobs that are encompassed by wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance and real estate; services; government--federal, state and local.
5. Agriculture is somewhat location specific, but more important is the lack of availability of jobs in this sector of the economy. Mechanization has reduced the labor requirements, and entrance into agricultural pursuits precludes many due to the large capital investments required.
6. For a detailed report on the representativeness of the sample, the mail questionnaire procedure, and quality of the data, see Dillman (1972), Carpenter (1974) and Dillman, et al (1974). In brief, slight over-representation occurs for husband wife households, persons age 25-64, households with incomes of over $10,000, and home owners.
7. Data on these studies is found in Dillman (1973:29-31). Due to differences in the way the questions were asked in the various studies on preference for a place to live, the findings are not strictly comparable. However, the consistency of the finding that the majority of people prefer to reside in areas, places, cities, or towns of less than 50,000 population, regardless of the specific wording of the question, makes it difficult to argue that such a residential preference does not exist.

Footnotes (continued)

8. Their question is as follows:

First, we are interested in the kind of community you would prefer to live in now, if you had your choice. 1. In terms of size, if you could live in any size community you wanted which one of these would you like best?: a large metropolitan city (over 500,000 in population); a medium sized city (50,000 to 500,000 in population); a smaller city (10,000 to 50,000 in population) (ASKA); a town or village (under 10,000 in population) (ASKA); in the country, outside of any city or village (ASKA); Don't know.

A. IF SMALLER THAN MEDIUM-SIZED CITY:

In terms of location, would you like that place to be within 30 miles of a large or medium-sized city, or would you rather be further away from such a city?: within 30 miles; farther away; don't know/ doesn't matter (1975: 494).

REFERENCES

Beale, Calvin L.

1975 The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America. Washington, D.C.: USDA Economic Research Service, ERS 605.

Bureau of the Census

1972 County and City Data Book. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office

1974a Mobility of the Population of the United States: March 1970 to March 1974. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 273, U. S. Government Printing Office.

1974b Federal-State Cooperation Program for Population Estiamtes--Arizona. U. S. Department of Commerce, P-26, No. 50. U. S. Government Printing Office.

1975 Historical Statistics of the U. S. Colonial Times to 1970, Part 1. U. S. Department of Commerce.

Carpenter, Edwin H.

1974 Collect More Extensive Social Science Data--Conduct Bilateral Interviews by Mail. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Society, Montreal (mimeographed).

Carpenter, Edwin H.

1975 Residential Preferences and Community Size: Implications for Population Redistribution in Arizona. Tucson: Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, Research Report, No. 7.

Commission on Population Growth and the American Future

1972 Population and the American Future. The Report of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

References continued

Committee on Community Development

1974 Report on National Growth and Development. (December) Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Council of Economic Advisers

1975 Annual Report in the Economic Report of the President. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

DeJong, Gordon F.

1975 "Population Redistribution Policies: Alternatives from the Netherlands, Great Britain, and Israel". Social Science Quarterly 56 (September):262-273.

DeJong, Gordon F. and Ralph R. Sell

1975 Residential Preferences and Migration Behavior. University Park: Population Issues Research Office, The Pennsylvania State University (mimeographed).

Dillman, Don A.

1972 "Increasing Mail Questionnaire Response in Large Samples of the General Public". Public Opinion Quarterly 36 (Summer):254-257.

1973 Population Distribution Policy and People's Attitudes: Current Knowledge and Needed Research. Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Dillman, Don A., James A. Christenson, Edwin H. Carpenter, and Ralph M. Brooks

1974 "Increasing Mail Questionnaire Response: A Four State Comparison." American Sociological Review 39 (October): 744-756.

Dillman, Don A. and Russell P. Dobash

1972 Preferences for Community Living and Their Implications for Population Redsitribution. Pullman: Washington State Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 765.

References continued

Fuguitt, Glenn V.

1971 "The Places Left Behind: Population Trends and Policy for Rural America." Rural Sociology 36 (December): 449-470.

Fuguitt, Glenn V. and James J. Zuiches

1975 "Residential Preferences and Population Distribution." Demography 12 (August): 491-504.

Hoover, Edgar M.

1972 "Policy Objectives for Population Distribution" Pp 650-664 in Sarah Mills Mazie (ed.), Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, Vol. 5, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Morrison, Peter A.

1972a "Dimensions of the Population Problem in the United States." Santa Monica; The Rand Corporation, R-864-CPG.

1972b "Population Movements and the Shape of Urban Growth: Implications for Public Policy." Santa Monica; Rand Corporation, P-1072-CPG.

National Goals Research Staff

1970 Toward Balanced Growth: Quantity with Quality. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Orbell, John M. and Torn Uno

1972 "A Theory of Neighborhood Problem Solving: Political Action vs. Residential Mobility." American Political Science Review 66 (4): 471-498.

Rossi, Peter H.

1955 Why Families Move: A Study in the Social Psychology of Urban Residential Mobility. New York: The Free Press.

Ryan, Vernon, Brian Blake, Ralph Brooks, and John Gordon

1974 Community Size Preference Patterns Among Indiana Residents. West Lafayette: Purdue Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 55.

References continued

Sabagh, Georges, Maurice van Arsdol, Jr., and Edgar Butler

1969 "Some Determinants of Intrametropolitan Residential Mobility: Conceptual Considerations." Social Forces 48: 88-98.

Social Security Bulletin

1973 Annual Statistical Supplement. Social Security Administration Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Speare, Alden, Jr.

1974 "Residential Satisfaction as an Intervening Variable in Residential Mobility." Demography 11 (May): 173-188.

Sundquist, James L.

1970 "Where Shall They Live." The Public Interest 18 (Winter): 88-101.

1975 Dispersing Population: What America Can Learn from Europe. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institute.

Taggert, Robert

1973 The Labor Market Impacts of the Private Retirement System: Studies in Public Welfare, Paper #11. Joint Committee Print for the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy.

Zuiches, James J. and Glenn V. Fuguitt

1972 "Residential Preference: Implications for Population Redistribution in Nonmetropolitan Areas." Pp. 620-630 in Sara Mills Mazie (ed.), Commission on Population Growth and The American Future, Vol. 5. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Table 1. Over Time Changes in Selected Characteristics of the United States.

Selected Characteristis	YEAR							
A.	1899	1909	1919	1929	1937-44	1948-53	1957-69	1970
Percent of Labor Force Not Engaged in Agriculture or Production of Goods.[a]	28.8	30.7	34.6	40.8	48.5	48.5	53.3	59.2
B.			1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970
Per Capita Disposable Personal Income (dollars adjusted to 1958 prices).[b]				1128	1259	1646	1883	2610

a. U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1975:240--industry divisions other than agriculture and goods producing are as follows: wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; services, government-federal, state and local. Percentages shown for grouped years are based on annual averages.

b. U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1975:225--all price adjustments in this table are made for total personal consumption expenditures. Index numbers from Council of Economic Advisors, 1975: 252.

Table 1. Over Time Changes in Selected Characteristics of the United States

Selected Characteristics	YEAR				
				1960-70	1970-73
C.					
Employment Changes in the U.S. by Metropolitan Status					
Average Annual Change -- Rate per 100 persons (in Percent).[c]					
Metropolitan Areas					
Total Employment				2.4	1.2
Nonfarm Goods Producing				1.3	-1.0
Nonfarm Service Performing				3.6	2.4
Nonmetropolitan Areas					
Total Employment				1.4	2.5
Nonfarm Goods Producing				2.7	2.8
Nonfarm Service Performing				3.0	3.6
D.		1950	1960	1970	
Percent of Labor Force (Private Employees only) covered by retirement.[d]		20.0	40.1	47.4	

c. Report on National Growth and Development 1974:36-37.

d. U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1975:343; 1972:225 and 384. Percentages are derived by adding together employees of nonagricultural establishments and agricultural establishments, subtracting out government employees (federal, state and local) and dividing this number into the number of private employees covered by retirement.

Selected Characteristics	YEAR				
E.	1950	1955	1960	1965	1970
Average Benefit Per Year for Private Retirement (dollars are adjusted to 1958 prices).e	991.60	934.27	938.78	1176.47	1205.72

F.	1962-63	1969
Age of Retirement Under Private Pension Plans (Percent of all covered workers).f		
No age requirements	----	6.0
55 and Under 60	1.0	3.0
60 to 62	10.0	8.0
62 to 64	1.0	14.0
65	88.0	68.0
Over 65	----	----

E. Taggert, 1973: 1

F. Taggert, 1973: 73

Table 1 (continued). Over Time Changes in Selected Characteristics of the United States

Selected Characteristics	YEAR				
G.					
		1955	1960	1965	1971
Declining Labor Force Participation Rates for Males--A result of Private Retirement Systems.g					
Age Cohort					
45-54		96.5	95.8	95.6	93.9
55-64		87.9	86.8	84.7	82.2
65 and over		39.6	33.1	27.9	25.5
H.					
	1940	1950	1960	1970	1973
Average Monthly Amount of Benefits Awarded to Retired Workers (Social Insurance--in dollars, adjusted to 1958 prices). h	49.91	35.0-40.09	79.43	95.76	116.38

g. Taggert, 1973: 74. "Though a number of other factors are involved, and undoubtedly of more importance than pension or profit sharing plans above, the private retirement system has contributed to the declining labor force participation rates of older cohorts in the population." P. 74.

h. Social Security Bulletin, 1973: 84.

Table 1 (continued) Over Time Changes in Selected Characteristics of the United States

Selected Characteristics	YEAR								
I.						1950	1960	1970	1973
Percent of Population age 65 and Over Receiving OASDHI or OAA or Both.[i]						36.6	71.6	89.6	90.0
J.	1900	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	
Percent of Population Age 62 and over.[j]	5.4	5.7	6.2	7.2	8.9	10.5	11.5	12.2	

i. Social Security Bulletin, 1973: 50.
Acronyms stand for Old-age survivors, disability, and health insurance (OASDHI) and old age assistance (OAA).

j. U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1975: 10.

Table 2. Percentage Distributions for Size of Area and Proximity to the Central City for Reported Current Residence and Preferred Residence along with two Measures of Size of Actual Residence.[a]

Size of Area and Proximity to Central City.	Reported Size and Proximity of Current Residence N = 1388	Preferred Size and Proximity of Residence N = 1390	Size of Area of Residence (Zip Code) N = 1416	Size of Area Of Residence (Reported Town Name) N = 1391
Large City (500,000 plus)				
Central City	16.2	1.0		
Suburb	9.4	1.3		
Open Country				
less than 15 minutes	1.4	0.4		
more than 15 minutes	.9	0.4		
Sub-total	27.9	3.1	34.1	33.5
Medium City (50,000-499,999)				
Central City	18.7	5.6		
Suburb	14.6	18.2		
Open Country				
less than 15 minutes	4.4	18.3		
more than 15 minutes	1.3	3.2		
Sub-total	39.0	45.3	31.9	33.9
Town or Place (under 50,000)				
Central City	14.4	5.9		
Suburb	7.2	11.8		
Open Country				
less than 15 minutes	8.2	24.0		
more than 15 minutes	3.3	9.9		
Sub-total	33.1	51.6	34.0	32.6
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

a. This table excludes 25 to 28 cases depending on what questions went unanswered by the respondents.

Table 3. Preferred Change in Proximity by Preferred Change in Size of Area of Residence.[a]

Preferred Proximity to Central City	Size of Area Preferred Compared To Size of Present Area: Smaller	Same	Larger	Row Total	Column Total
	----------Percentage----------				
Closer Than Present (N = 96)	27	59	14	100	7
Same as Present (N = 450)	31	63	6	100	33
More Distant Than Present (N = 819)	47	47	6	100	60

a. This table excludes 51 cases where respondents failed to answer one or more of the questions.

Table 4. Interest in Moving to a Place of 2,500-10,000 Population that is 30 Minutes or At Least 1 Hour's Drive From a City of 50,000 Plus Inhabitants, by Size of Present Area of Residence.

Size of Present Area of Residence	Proximity to City of 50,000 or More Population											
	30 MINUTES AWAY						1 HOUR AWAY OR MORE					
	Not Interested	Not Very Int.	Interested	Very Interested	Total	N[a]	Not Interested	Not Very Int.	Interested	Very Interested	Total	N[a]
	Percentage						Percentage					
Large City (500,000 +)	30	25	26	19	100	386	52	20	20	8	100	386
Medium City (50,000-499.999)	33	26	29	12	100	534	54	26	14	6	100	528
Town or Place (less than 50,000)	30	21	27	22	100	440	46	20	22	12	100	441
% of Total	31	24	28	17	100	1360	51	23	18	8	100	1355

a. Totals vary for the two proximities due to loss of cases from non-response to one or more questions. For the 30 minute proximity, 56 cases were omitted; 61 cases for the at least 1 hour proximity.

Table 5. Interest in Living Removed from a City of 50,000 plus by Continued Interest with a 10 Percent Loss of Income.[a]

Interest in Living Away from a City of 50,000+	Interested Even With 10% Loss In Income						
30 Minute Proximity	Yes	D.K.	No	Skipped Out	Total	% of Total	N
	Percentages						
Very Interested	62	21	17	----	100	18	231
Interested	37	29	34	----	100	28	371
Not Very Interested	15	23	62	----	100	24	322
Not At All Interested	--	--	--	100	100	30	400
Percent of Total	24	18	28	30	100	100	1324
1 Hour or More Proximity							
Very Interested	76	14	10	----	100	9	113
Interested	41	34	25	----	100	18	240
Not Very Interested	14	25	61	----	100	23	306
Not At All Interested	--	--	--	100	100	50	649
Percent of Total	17	13	20	50	100	100	1308

a. Number of cases omitted due to nonresponse to one or more questions is 92 for 30 minutes proximity and 108 for the 1 hour or more proximity.

Table 6. Degree of Satisfcation with Present Community and Desire to Move Away.[a]

Degree of Satisfaction	Desire to Move Away: Really like to leave if given opportunity	Probably more satisfied in another community	Makes no difference	Would be reluctant to leave	Would never consider leaving	Total
	Percentages					
Not at all satisfied (N=54)	74	17	0	4	5	100
Not very much satisfied (N=204)	35	33	13	16	3	100
Pretty much satisfied (N=640)	5	11	21	59	4	100
Very much satisfied (N=492)	1	1	5	74	19	100

Potential Migrants, N=189, 14%

a. Twenty-six respondents who failed to respond to one or the other or both questions were not included in this tabulation.

Table 7. Potential Migrants and Nonmigrants Interest (with 10% loss of income) in living in a Place of 2,500 to 10,000 Population that is a 30 Minute or at Least 1 Hour's Drive from a City of 50,000 or More, by Size of Present Area of Residence.

Size of Present Place of Residence	Proximity to City of 50,000 or More Inhabitants							
	30 Minutes Drive				At Least 1 Hour's Drive			
	Interested		Not Interested		Interested		Not Interested	
	Potential Migrant	Potential Nonmigrant	Potential Migrant	Potential Nonmigrant	Potential Migrant	Potential Nonmigrant	Potential Migrant	Potential Nonmigrant
	Percentages							
Large City (500,000 plus)	50	26	41	26	56	24	40	26
Medium City (50,000-499,999)	33	34	27	42	30	35	29	42
Town or Place (less than 50,000)	17	40	32	32	14	41	31	32
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
(N=)	(92)	(235)	(95)	(925)	(70)	(160)	(116)	(1001)
% of Total[a]	7	17	7	69	5	12	9	74

a. Due to nonresponse on one or more of the questions, 69 cases were omitted for each proximity.

Table 8. Size of Present Area of Residence, by Size of Preferred Place of Residence for Potential Migrants and Nonmigrants.

Size of Present Place of Residence	Size of Place Preferred: Potential Migrants — Large Metro	Medium Metro	Non-Metro	Total	(N=)[a]	% of Total	Potential Nonmigrants — Large Metro	Medium Metro	Non-Metro	Total	(N=)[a]	% of Total
	Percentages											
Large City (500,000 plus)	4	28	68	100	(85)	46	8	63	29	100	(297)	25
Medium City (50,000-499,999)	7	29	64	100	(56)	30	2	66	32	100	(477)	41
Town or Place (less than 50,000)	2	25	73	100	(45)	24	1	17	82	100	(402)	34
% of Total	4	28	68	---	(186)	100	3	48	49	--	(1176)	100

A. Due to nonresponse to one or more questions, 54 cases are omitted.

Table 9. Proximity to Present City of Residence, by Preferred Proximity to Preferred City of Residence for Potential Migrants and Nonmigrants.

Proximity to Present City of Residence	Preferred Proximity to Place Preferred													
	Potential Migrants							Potential Nonmigrants						
	Central City	Suburb	Less Than 15 min.	More Than 15 min.	Total	Percent of Total	(N=)[a]	Central City	Suburb	Less Than 15 min.	More Than 15 min.	Total	Percent of Total	(N=)[a]
	Percentages							Percentages						
Central City	17	14	55	14	100	50	(93)	22	36	32	10	100	49	(583)
Suburb	9	11	55	25	100	36	(67)	4	45	42	9	100	31	(363)
Open Country														
less than 15 min.	15	5	70	10	100	11	(20)	3	15	63	19	100	15	(172)
more than 15 min.	17	17	33	33	100	3	(6)	2	17	46	35	100	5	(65)
% of Total	14	12	56	18	---	100	(186)	12	35	40	13	---	100	(1183)

a. Due to nonresponse to one or more questions, 47 cases are omitted.